UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,542	06/28/2001	Vernon Meadows	BLL-0036	6211

36192 7590 12/15/2003

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER	
ESCALANTE, OVIDIO	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	16

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/894,542	MEADOWS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ovidio Escalante	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 October 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,20-35,37-56 and 58-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,20-35,37-56 and 58-74* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on October 8, 2003. **Claims 1-18,20-35,37-56,58-74** are now pending in the present application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 56 is objected to because of the following informalities: "(AI7N)" apparently should be changed to --(AIN)--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-16,20-33 and 37-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanson et al. US Patent 6,014,427.

Regarding claims 1,18 and 37, Hanson teaches a method and a system processor for providing a status certification for a message (voicemail message) in a communications network (abstract; fig. 9; col. 9, lines 48-64; the message originator can receive a certified status report for a specific message) comprising:

assigning a message identifier for said message, (e.g. ID#002: template #4), (figs. 7-9; col. 5, lines 52-55);

creating a disposition identifier in response to a disposition event, (col. 5, lines 55-61; col. 9, lines 23-29; disposition identifiers include among other things, message recipients who reply or have not responded);

associating said disposition identifier with said message, (col. 5, lines 55-61; col. 9, lines 4-22);

receiving a request for a status notification of said message from a sender of said message, (col. 9, lines 48-64; the sender requests a status report);

compiling said message identifier and said disposition identifier to generate said status notification, (col. 5, lines 52-61; col. 9, lines 4-47; the identifiers are compiled into their corresponding fields; 9, lines 48-64); and

providing said status notification in response to said request, (fig. 9; col. 9, lines 48-64; the sender receives the report).

Regarding claims 2,20 and 38, Hanson teaches billing a party to said message for said providing of said status certification, (col. 7, lines 17-24; the party is billed fro using the entire service therefore, since status certification is part of the service then the user is charged for using status certification).

Regarding claims 3,21 and 39, Hanson teaches wherein said disposition event comprises at least one of: a managing event; and a dispatching event, (col. 5, lines 52-61; col. 9, lines 38-47).

Regarding claims 4,22 and 40, Hanson teaches wherein said managing event comprises at least one of: accessing said message and presenting an indication of said message, (col. 5, lines 52-61; fig. 9).

Regarding claims 5,23 and 41, Hanson teaches wherein said managing event comprises at least one of: denying said status certification of said message, (col. 9, lines 48-64; fig. 9).

Regarding claims 6,24 and 42, Hanson teaches wherein said dispatching event comprises at least one of: forwarding said message; and replying to said message, (col. 7, lines 17-24).

Regarding claims 7,25 and 43, Hanson teaches wherein said status notification comprises at least one of: an audio message and a text message, (col. 9, lines 48-64).

Regarding claim 8 and 44, Hanson teaches wherein said communications network comprises a telecommunications network and an electronic communications network, (fig. 1; col. 2, lines 44-67).

Regarding claims 9,26 and 45, Hanson teaches wherein said message identifier comprises an alphanumeric identifier, (fig. 9).

Regarding claims 10,27 and 46, Hanson teaches wherein said message identifier comprises at least one of: a role identifier; a party identifier; a date identifier; and a time identifier, (fig. 9; col. 9, lines 4-47).

Regarding claims 11,28 and 47, Hanson teaches wherein said role identifier comprises at least one of: an originator; a sender; a caller and a recipient, (fig. 9).

Regarding claims 12,29 and 48, Hanson teaches wherein said party identifier comprises an access address, (fig. 9).

Regarding claims 13,30 and 49, Hanson teaches storing an attribute for said status certification for said message, wherein said attribute comprises at least one of: said message identifier; said disposition identifier; and said status notification, (col. 9, lines 4-37; figs 7-9).

Regarding claims 14,31 and 50, Hanson teaches administrative functionality, wherein said administrative functionality comprises at least one of: monitoring said attribute and informing a recipient of said attribute, (col. 7, line 55-col. 8, line 3; col. 9, lines 4-47).

Regarding claims 15,32 and 54, Hanson teaches wherein said request comprises a secure request, (col. 3, lines 46-51).

Regarding claims 16 and 33, Hanson teaches wherein said request comprises dialing an access number, (col. 3, lines 38-46).

Regarding claim 51, Hanson teaches a data repository for storing at least one of said message, said message identifier, said disposition identifier, and said report, (col. 3, lines 16-32).

Regarding claim 52, Hanson teaches wherein said data repository comprises a database, (fig. 2; col. 3, lines 16-32).

Regarding claim 53, Hanson teaches wherein said data repository comprises: a first database for storing said message; and a second database for storing said attribute, (fig. 2).

Regarding claim 55, Hanson teaches a network access device to issue said request, wherein said network access device comprises at least one of: a telephone; a cellular-capable device and a computer, (fig. 2; col. 2, lines 50-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 56,58-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of LaPorta et al. US Patent 6,014,429.

Regarding claim 56, Hanson teaches a system for providing a status certification for a voicemail message in a network (col. 9, lines 48-64; the message sender can receive a certified status report for a specific sent message) comprising:

an intelligent peripheral operative to assign a message identifier (figs. 7-9) for said message, (col. 5, lines 52-55; col. 9, lines 23-29);

said intelligent peripheral further operative to create a disposition identifier in response to a disposition event, (col. 5, lines 55-61); and

said intelligent peripheral further operative to associate said disposition identifier with said message, (col. 5, lines 55-61).

said intelligent peripheral further operative to receive a request for a status notification from a sender of said message, (col. 9, lines 48-64; the sender can request a report);

said intelligent peripheral further operative to compile said message identifier and said disposition identifier to generate said status notification, (col. 5, lines 52-61; col. 8, lines 4-47); and

said intelligent peripheral further operative to provide said status notification in response to said request, (fig. 9; col. 9, lines 48-64).

Hanson does not specifically teach of the network being an advanced intelligence network.

LaPorta teaches that it was well known in the art to provide messaging services in an AIN system, (col. 19, lines 52-67; fig. 2). LaPorta also teaches of providing message status information to a message sender.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson by using an AIN network system as taught by LaPorta so that network components can communicate with each other with signaling information instead of using in band channels. The Examiner notes that AIN networks are well-

known the art and one skilled in the art who have employed an AIN system into Hanson so that voice in-band channels do not have to be used for signaling remote devices.

Regarding claim 58, Hanson teaches wherein said intelligent peripheral is further operative to: bill a party to said message for said providing of said status certification, (col. 7, lines 17-24; as shown above, the party is billed for receiving status certification).

Regarding claim 59, Hanson teaches wherein said disposition event comprises at least one of: a managing event; and a dispatching event, (col. 5, lines 52-61; col. 9, lines 38-47).

Regarding claim 60, Hanson teaches wherein said managing event comprises at least one of : accessing said message and presenting an indication of said message, (col. 5, lines 52-61; fig. 9).

Regarding claim 61, Hanson teaches wherein said managing event comprises denying said status certification of said message, (col. 9, lines 48-64).

Regarding claim 62, Hanson teaches wherein said dispatching event comprises at least one of: forwarding said message; and replying to said message, (col. 7, lines 17-24).

Regarding claim 63, Hanson teaches wherein said status notification comprises at least one of: an audio message and a text message, (col. 9, lines 48-64).

Regarding claim 64, Hanson teaches wherein said message identifier comprises an alphanumeric identifier, (fig. 9).

Regarding claim 65, Hanson teaches wherein said message identifier comprises at least one of: a role identifier; a party identifier; a date identifier; and a time identifier, (col. 9, lines 4-47).

Regarding claim 66, Hanson teaches wherein said role identifier comprises at least one of: an originator; sender; caller and recipient, (fig. 9).

Regarding claim 67, Hanson teaches wherein said party identifier comprises at least one an access address, (fig. 9).

Regarding claim 68, Hanson teaches wherein said intelligent peripheral is further operative to store an attribute for said status certification for said message, wherein said attribute comprises at least one of: said message identifier; said disposition identifier; and said status notification, (figs. 7-9; col. 9, lines 4-37).

Regarding claim 69, Hanson teaches a service management system wherein said service management system is operative to perform administrative functionality, wherein said administrative functionality comprises at least one of: monitoring said attribute and informing a recipient of said attribute, (col. 7, lines 4-37; col. 9, lines 4-47).

Regarding claim 70, Hanson teaches wherein said request is a secure request, (col. 3, lines 46-51).

Regarding claim 71, Hanson teaches a network access device to issue said request, wherein said network access device comprises at least one of: a telephone; a television; a cellular-capable device; a personal digital assistant; and a computer, (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 72, Hanson in view of LaPorta teach a service switching point (18, LaPorta) functionally connected to said intelligent peripheral; and an interface functionally (two-way messaging network, LaPorta) connected to said service switching point (18, LaPorta) and operative to accept a communication directed to said AIN, (LaPorta). LaPorta, as applied above, teaches that it was well-known in the art and it would have been obvious to use an AIN system.

Regarding claim 73, while Hanson suggest the use of wireless personal communication devices, (col. 2, lines 48-57), Hanson does not specifically teach of using a MTSO, however, it would have been obvious to use a MTSO since the wireless device needs the MTSO if the wireless device wants to communicate with the network.

Nonetheless, LaPorta teach a mobile telephone switching office (MTSO) functionally connected to said interface and operative to facilitate a cellular device communication directed to said AIN, (col. 17, lines 33-56, LaPorta).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a MTSO so that the wireless device of Hanson can communicate with the network.

Regarding claim 74, Hanson in view of LaPorta teach a computer network functionally connected to said interface and operative to facilitate a computer-based communication directed to said AIN, (fig. 1, Hanson; fig. 2, LaPorta).

7. Claims 17 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Picard.

Regarding claims 17 and 34, while Hanson teaches wherein said request comprises an address, Hanson does not specifically teaches wherein said request comprises a hypertext transfer protocol request (HTTP) directed to a uniform resource locator address (URL).

Picard teaches that it was well known in the art to request status information for various types of messages that the user has sent. Picard further teaches of wherein a user makes a request to the system and wherein the request comprises a hypertext transfer protocol request (HTTP) directed to a uniform resource locator address (URL).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson by allowing a user to make a request using a HTTP request which is directed to a URL as taught by Picard so that Internet users can access their multi-media messages via their computer.

8. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al. US Patent 6,233,318 in view of Hanson US Patent 6,215,859.

Regarding claim 35, Picard teaches a method for providing a status certification for a video mail message in a video enabled communications network (col. 7, lines 13-19; Picard teaches of providing status information for video, voice, text and facsimile messages) comprising:

assigning a message identifier for said message, (col. 13, lines 22-32; each message has an ID so that it can be located in the network);

creating a disposition identifier in response to a disposition event, (col. 7, lines 13-19; status ID is created (new/read, urgent, replied to, forward); and

associating said disposition identifier with said message, (col. 7, lines 13-19).

receiving a request for a status notification, (col. 7, lines 13-19);

compiling said message identifier and said disposition identifier to generate said status notification, (col. 2, lines 26-33; col. 7, lines 13-19); and

providing said status notification in response to said request, (col. 2, lines 26-33; col. 7, lines 13-19).

Picard does not specifically teach of receiving a request for a status notification from a sender of the message. However, Picard suggests of providing status information to a user

therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the system of Picard to include status notification to the sender so that the sender will known the current status of their message.

Nonetheless, Hanson teaches that it was well known in the art to send a message and to send to the message sender message status information such as whether the message has been retrieved by the recipient, (col. 6, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Picard by sending status notification of the message to the sender of the message as taught by Hanson so that the message sender can receive current message status information such as the message being delivered.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed October 8, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1,18 and 37, Applicants contend that Hanson neither discloses nor teaches: "creating a disposition identifier in response to a disposition event; associating said disposition identifier with said message; receiving a request for a status notification of said message from a sender of said message; compiling said message identifier and said disposition identifier to generate said status notification; and providing said status notification to said sender in response to said request" since Hanson discloses providing a selected response among predefined responses for an action message to the originator, instead of the status of the action message and in which the availability of the status information is not dependent on action taken by a recipient of the message. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., in which the availability of the status information is not dependent on action taken by a recipient of the message.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, in response to the argument that Hanson does not teach of providing the status of the message the Examiner notes that the status report of Hanson does provide the status of the message as shown in figure 9. Total messages send and received are provided as well as message recipient who have not reviewed the sent messages. Since "status information" is a broad term and since Hanson provides to the sender the current message status as shown above, the Examiner believes that he current claims, as amended, reads on the Hanson reference.

Regarding claim 56, Applicant contends that Hanson in view of LaPorta does not render obvious claim 56 for the reasons stated above and since LaPorta does not cure the deficiencies of Hanson. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As stated above Hanson teaches of receiving a request for a status notification from a sender of said message since Hanson provides status information such as responses sent/received. The broad language of "status information" reads of providing the sender with messages that have been sent and received since the "sending and receiving" are considered to be status information.

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9314, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ovidio Escalante whose telephone number is (703) 308-6262. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [fan.tsang@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ovidio Escalante
Examiner
Group 2645
December 4, 2003

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600